DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 167 780 **CE 020 180**

AUTHOR Webb, Earl S.; And Others
TITLE Follow-up of Agricultural Education Graduates from Texas A&M University for the Years 1965-1971. Departmental Information Report No. 78-6.
INSTITUTION Texas A and M Univ., College Station. Dept. of Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology.
SPONS AGENCY Texas A and M Univ., College Station. Dept. of Agricultural Education.
PUB DATE 78
NOTE 85p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Agricultural Education; *College Graduates; Curriculum Evaluation; Curriculum Planning; Failure Factors; *Program Effectiveness; *Program Evaluation; Questionnaires; Success Factors
IDENTIFIERS *Texas A & M University

ABSTRACT

A follow-up study of agricultural education graduates from Texas A & M University was conducted to determine the effectiveness of the curriculum in agricultural education at the University in the preparation of graduates for careers in agriculture and to determine the factors which might influence the choice of and success in either teaching or alternate careers. Data were obtained from 186 of the 280 questionnaires mailed to graduates for the years 1965 through 1971. Results of the study include the following: the factor that influenced graduates most to major in agricultural education was the desire to secure a broad knowledge of scientific agriculture; more course hours in horticulture were recommended; and the factor that had the greatest degree of influence on graduates to enter the teaching profession was the opportunity to work with youth (the greatest dislikes were the salary level and lack of advancement opportunities). It was concluded that former students were satisfied with their curricular experiences at Texas A & M University. Finally, based on the findings, the following recommendations were made: more courses in horticulture should be added to the curriculum in agricultural education; efforts should be increased to encourage students to take advantage of career counseling on the campus; and students who do not plan to teach should be directed into courses in journalism and business. (JH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

FOLLOW-UP OF AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION GRADUATES FROM TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY FOR THE YEARS 1965-1971

ED167780

Departmental Information Report No. 78-6

by

Earl S. Webb, Professor

Thomas W. Stoner, Research Assistant

Randy Vaclavik, Research Assistant

The Texas Agricultural Experiment Station

Neville P. Clarke, Director

The Texas A&M University System

College Station, Texas 77843

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Earl S. Webb

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

December, 1978

CE 020 180

ABSTRACT

Follow-up of Agricultural Education Graduates From
Texas A&M University for the Years 1965-1971
(December, 1978)
Earl S. Webb, Professor, Texas A&M University
Thomas W. Stoner and
Randy Vaclavik,
Research Assistants

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to determine the effectiveness of the curriculum in agricultural education at Texas A&M University in the preparation of graduates for careers in agriculture and to determine the factors which might influence the choice of and success in either teaching or alternative careers. The following specific objectives served as guidelines for implementing the study:

1. To determine the persons and factors that influenced graduates to select Texas A&M University and to major in agricultural education.

2. To obtain information to help improve curricular offerings for career preparation of graduates.

3. To determine career patterns of graduates both in and out of the field of education.

Data were obtained from 186 of the 280 questionnaires mailed to agricultural education graduates for the years 1965 through 1971 for a 66.4 percent return.

Results of this Study

1. Vocational agriculture teachers were clearly the persons most influential in helping graduates choose agricultural education as a major. The factor that influenced graduates most to major in agricultural education was "the desire to secure a broad knowledge of scientific agriculture."
2. The persons most influential in affecting graduates to attend Texas A&M University were "parents," with "former or contemporary A&M students" also exerting a great deal of influence. The most important factors that influenced graduates to attend Texas A&M was "good agricultural facilities," "high academic standards," and "Aggie spirit."
3. More than 42 percent of the respondents made the decision to major in agricultural education before entering college while the remainder decided after beginning college.
4. The leading occupation of the supporting parents of graduates was "full-time farm/ranch operator." Overall, more than 63 percent of the parents of graduates were employed in some agricultural occupation.
5. Regarding recommendations for curricular changes, technical agriculture and economic subjects were most often recommended for increases. Surprisingly, horticulture was recommended for an increase by more graduates than for any other curricular area.
6. The factor that had the greatest degree of influence on graduates to enter the teaching profession was "the opportunity to work with youth." The greatest dislikes were the "salary level" and "lack of advancement opportunities."

7. The principal reason former teachers left the profession was that they felt the salary level was too low.
8. The median annual gross salary of the former teachers in their present job (at time of study) was about $18,000, while the annual gross salary of teachers was approximately $14,500.
9. The non-teaching graduates (those that never taught) entered a wide variety of occupations upon graduation. Their median salary for their present occupation was about $19,000.

Conclusions

Based on the data in this study the following conclusions seem appropriate.

1. Former students are rather well satisfied with their curricular experiences gained in agricultural education at Texas A&M University.
2. Graduates tend to evaluate their college curriculum in light of the occupation in which they are employed at the time a study is conducted.
3. A majority of graduates have a positive attitude toward the department and are glad to provide information requested in a follow-up study.

Recommendations

Based on the findings in this study, the following recommendations are made for consideration by the faculty in agricultural education.

1. Efforts should be made to find one or more courses in horticulture to be added to the curriculum in agricultural education.
2. Because of the indecision of such a high percentage of graduates about career choices, efforts should be increased to encourage students to take advantage of career counseling available on the campus.

3. Students who definitely do not plan to teach should be directed into courses in journalism and business management.
4. Rapport and good working relationships should be developed and maintained with the University Placement Office especially for the benefit of those graduates who do not plan to teach.
5. Periodic follow-up studies should be conducted to maintain contact with former students and to evaluate curricular offerings by the Department.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
Purpose of the Study	2
Limitations of the Study	3
Definition of Terms	3
Procedure	4
Analysis and Interpretation of Data	6
Persons that Influenced Graduates	7
Persons that Influenced Graduates to Major in Agricultural Education	7
Persons Influencing Graduates to Earn a Degree from Texas A&M University	8
Factors Influencing Graduates	10
Factors Influencing Graduates to Earn a Degree from Texas A&M University	10
Factors Influencing Graduates to Major in Agricultural Education	11
Time of Decision to Major in Agricultural Education	13
From Where Did Graduates Enter TAMU	14
Major Occupation of Supporting Parent of Graduates	15
Post Graduate Education of Respondents	16
Graduates' Opinion of Agricultural Education	18
Changes Graduates Believe Should Be Made in Course Areas	20
Agricultural Economics	20
Agricultural Education	25
Agronomy	25
Agricultural Engineering	26
Animal Science	26
Entomology	27
Horticulture	27
Poultry Science	28
Range Science	28
Biology	28
Chemistry	29
English	29
Mathematics	30
Educational Curriculum and Instruction	30
Educational Psychology	31
Course Areas Graduates Believe Should or Should Not Be Included in the Agricultural Education Curriculum	31
Business Management	31
Journalism	33
Speech	33
Technical Writing	33

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Cont).

	Page
Career Patterns of Teachers	34
Factors That Influenced Graduates To Enter Teaching	34
Number of Teaching Positions Held	35
Contact With First Employer	36
What Teachers Liked Most About Teaching	37
What Teachers Disliked Most About Teaching	37
Career Patterns of Former Teachers	38
Factors That Influenced Graduates to Leave Teaching	39
Jobs After Leaving Teaching	40
Annual Gross Salary of Graduates	41
The Extent Teaching Experience Helped Graduates in Current Job	44
Career Patterns of Non-Teachers	44
Degree of Influence Factors Had on Non-Teachers Decision Not to Enter Teaching	45
When Graduate Decided Not To Teach	46
How Non-Teachers Contacted First Employer	46
First Job After Graduation	47
Annual Gross Salary for Non-Teachers First Job	48
Annual Gross Salary for Non-Teacher's Present Occupations	48
How Helpful Was Student Teaching Experience for Non-Teaching Jobs	51
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	52
Summary	52
Conclusions	57
Recommendations	58
APPENDIX	59
Questionnaire	60

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Number of Respondents in Each Career Category	1
2	Number of Agricultural Education Graduates Completing Questionnaires by Year of Graduation	6
3	Degree of Influence Persons Had on Graduates to Choose Agricultural Education as a Major Field of Study	8
4	Degree of Influence Persons Had on Graduate's Decision to Earn Degree from Texas A&M University	9
5	Degree of Influence Factors Had on Graduate's Decision to Earn Degree from Texas A&M University	10
6	Degree of Influence Factors Had on Decision of Graduates to Major in Agricultural Education	12
7	When Graduates First Decided to Major in Agricultural Education	13
8	From Where Did Graduate Enter Texas A&M University	14
9	Major Occupation of Supporting Parent of Graduates	15
10	Major Occupation of the Parents When Graduates Entered College	16
11	Post Graduate Education of Graduates	17
12	If Possible to Start College Over, Would Graduates Major in Agricultural Education Again?	18
13	Would Graduates Recommend Agricultural Education for Major to High School Student	19
14	How Helpful Were Agricultural Education Faculty?	20
15	Changes Graduates Believe Should Be Made in Course Areas (N=181)	21
16	Changes Teachers Believe Should Be Made in Course Areas (N=40)	22
17	Changes Former Teachers Believe Should Be Made in Course Areas (N=52)	23

LIST OF TABLES (Cont.)

Table		Page
18	Changes Non-Teachers Believe Should Be Made in Course Areas (N=94)	24
19	Additional Course Areas Graduates Believe Should or Should Not Be Included in the Agricultural Education Curriculum	32
20	Degree of Influence Factors Had on Graduates' Decision to Enter The Teaching Profession	35
21	Number of Teaching Positions Held	36
22	Contact with First Employer	36
23	What Teachers Liked Most About Teaching	37
24	What Graduates Disliked Most About Teaching	38
25	Degree of Influence Factors Had on Graduate's Decision to Leave Teaching	39
26	Former Teachers First Job After Leaving Teaching	40
27	Annual Gross Salary of Former Teachers in First Occupation After Graduation by Occupational areas	42
28	Annual Gross Salary of Former Teachers in Present Occupation by Occupational Areas	43
29	Extent Teaching Experience Helped Graduates in Current Job	44
30	Influence Factors Had on Non-Teacher's Decison Not to Enter Teaching Profession	45
31	When Graduate Decided Not to Teach	46
32	How Non-Teachers Made Contact with First Employer	47
33	Non-Teachers First Job After Graduation	47
34	Annual Gross Salary of Non-Teachers in First Occupation after Graduation by Occupational Areas	49
35	Annual Gross Salary of Non-Teachers in Present Occupation by Occupational Areas	50
36	How Helpful Student Teaching Experience was for Graduates in Non-Teaching Jobs	51

INTRODUCTION

Agricultural educators in universities across the nation, including those at Texas A&M University, are continually concerned with both the quality and quantity of graduates of their departments. Over the last several years there has been an unprecedented increase in numbers of vocational agriculture teachers needed to fill positions in Texas secondary public schools. More teachers will need training also in conducting new and expanded programs of vocational agriculture. Texas A&M has historically placed only about 30 percent of its graduates in vocational agriculture teaching positions. The majority of graduates find employment in agribusiness or in agriculturally related jobs in governmental agencies and private industries, and as self-employed farmers or ranchers.

In order for the agricultural education faculty at Texas A&M University to be proficient in preparing young people for employment in such diversified occupations, it must continue to update and maintain an effective, flexible curriculum. One method of evaluating the relevance of curricular offerings is by soliciting follow-up data from graduates working in the different career fields. In addition, the Agricultural Education Department at Texas A&M must subject itself to constant evaluation through feedback from school administrators and other employees and from graduates returning for in-service training, contests, and post-graduate education.

Benefits from follow-up studies can be realized in ways other than as a means of evaluating the curriculum. High school students and junior college graduates many times ask such questions as "What is Agricultural Education?" "Can I get a job when I graduate?" "What kind of job can I get?"

"What is the pay scale?" Data obtained and interpreted from follow-up studies can help answer these and other questions. University counselors, administrators, and placement officers can use information from follow-up studies in counseling and recruiting students for careers in agricultural education.

In short, the performance of its graduates as educators and professionals in alternative careers may be directly related to experiences and education received by the graduates through their major departments and institutions. Studies such as this one, made periodically, can aid agricultural educators in systematically appraising the progress of departmental graduates.

Purpose of the Study

The overall purpose of this investigation was to determine the effectiveness of the curriculum in Agricultural Education in the preparation of graduates for careers in agriculture and to determine factors which might influence the choice of and success in either teaching or alternative careers. The following specific objectives served as guidelines for implementing the study:

1. To determine the persons and factors that influenced graduates to earn a degree from Texas A&M University and to select agricultural education as a major field of study.
2. To obtain information to help improve curricular offerings for career preparation.

3. To determine the career patterns of graduates.

Limitations of the Study

This study included only students who received the bachelor of science degree in agricultural education at Texas A&M University during the period of January 1965 to May 1971. The study had certain inherent limitations incurred when dealing with descriptive research. Limitations were:

1. The accuracy of the results was limited by the respondent's ability to recall factors over a long period of time.
2. The use of a structured questionnaire, in lieu of personal interviews, may have had a tendency to limit responses and to suggest certain factors.
3. The accuracy of the results was limited to the degree that the graduates were able to make valid appraisals of the effectiveness of their curricular experiences.

Definition of Terms

Agricultural Education - A course of study which prepares college students to be teachers of vocational agriculture in public high schools, or as professionals in some other phase of agricultural employment.

Graduates - Persons receiving the bachelor of science degree in agricultural education from Texas A&M University.

Teachers - Those graduates who were teaching vocational agriculture in Texas secondary public schools at the time of the study.

Former Teachers - Graduates who at one time in their career taught vocational agriculture in public schools and later terminated employment as teachers.

Non-teachers - Graduates who had never taught vocational agriculture in secondary public schools.

Career category - A grouping of similar types of jobs in which various individuals were engaged, namely teachers, former teachers, and non-teachers.

Procedure

After establishing the objectives of the study, it was decided that a questionnaire should be used to solicit feedback from the graduates, in lieu of personal interviews. The questionnaire (See Appendix) was a closed form instrument designed to minimize the number of questions that would be applicable to respondents in different career categories. It was therefore divided into four separate sections: (1) to be answered by all graduates, (2) to be answered by all graduates who were teaching vocational agriculture, (3) to be answered by graduates who had entered and then left the teaching field, and (4) to be answered by those graduates who never entered the teaching field.

On most items, graduates were requested to rate the item on a 5-point Likert scale where 5 represented supreme influence and 1 represented no influence. Many items provided a space where comments could be made if the respondent felt an explanation was needed. Each questionnaire was coded, with the code known only to the investigator so that graduates might respond candidly to the questions asked.

The questionnaire, as originally developed, was reviewed by a number of agricultural education graduates; suggested changes were made accordingly. Names of all graduates for the years 1965-1971 were obtained from commencement programs; their addresses were found in the current Directory of Former Students of Texas A&M University. The questionnaires were mailed, accompanied with return address and postage, to 280 graduates.

A follow-up mailing was sent to non-respondents about a month after the initial mailing. Eventually 186 or 66.4 percent of the questionnaires were returned and used in the tabulation and analysis of responses. After receiving the returned questionnaire, respondents were classified into career categories. As shown in Table 1, 92 of the respondents or almost 50 percent were initially employed as teachers. This figure is not consistent with the traditional 25 to 30 percent of graduates from the Agricultural Education Department who become teachers. This discrepancy can be explained, however, by the fact that a much higher percentage of teachers and former teachers returned questionnaires than did the non-teacher group.

Table 1. Number of Respondents in Each Career Category

Career Category	Number of Respondents	Percent of Respondents
Current teacher of vocational agriculture (Teachers)	40	21.5
Dropped out of teaching (Former Teachers)	52	28.0
Never taught vocational agriculture (Non-Teachers)	94	50.5
Totals	186	100.0

Responses from each questionnaire were placed on data processing fortran sheets to be utilized for computer tabulation, at which time the respondents were coded according to year of graduation, and career category. The number of graduates for each year who completed and returned questionnaires can be found in Table 2.

Data were compiled by computer. Because of the variety of questions asked, the analysis of data was based primarily on calculation of means or on frequency distributions.

Table 2. Number of Agricultural Education Graduates Completing Questionnaires by Year of Graduation

Year	Total
1965	16
1966	28
1967	26
1968	30
1969	34
1970	28
1971	24
Total	186

Analysis and Interpretation of Data

The data being analyzed and presented in this section were compiled from 186 questionnaires completed by Texas A&M University graduates of the Agricultural Education Department. Some graduates failed to respond to all items, therefore, the number of responses to some items will be less than the total respondents in the study.

The data are presented in the same order as the three objectives of this study. These objectives were:

1. To determine the persons and factors that influenced graduates to earn a degree from Texas A&M University and to select agricultural education as a major field of study.
2. To obtain information to help improve curricular offerings for career preparation.
3. To determine the career patterns of graduates.

Persons that Influenced Graduates

Persons that Influenced Graduates to Major in Agricultural Education.

The decisions of high school seniors and college transfer students to major in agricultural education are influenced by a number of persons. Eight persons were listed in the instrument to determine those persons who influenced the graduates to choose agricultural education as a major.

Table 3 shows the mean response derived from the 186 completed questionnaires. Vocational agriculture teachers were found to be the most influential persons by all three groups--teachers, former teachers and non-teachers in making their decision to major in agricultural education with mean scores of 3.60, 3.35, and 3.31, respectively. Parents, friends, and college faculty members were other influential persons. High school counselors were rated as having the least influence by respondents with a mean of 1.28.

Table 3. Degree of Influence Persons Had on Graduates to Choose Agricultural Education as a Major Field of Study

Person	Mean Response*			
	Overall N=186	Teachers N=40	Former Teachers N=52	Non-Teachers N=94
Vocational Agriculture Teacher	3.35	3.60	3.35	3.31
Parents	2.73	3.08	2.58	2.70
Friends	2.56	2.45	2.35	2.44
College Faculty Members	2.41	2.80	2.44	2.23
Relatives	1.88	2.23	1.82	1.73
County Agent	1.76	1.56	1.73	1.85
High School Teacher (Not Voc. Agri.)	1.37	1.43	1.39	1.32
High School Counselor	1.28	1.20	1.31	1.30

*5 = supreme; 1 = none

Persons Influencing Graduates to Earn a Degree from Texas A&M University.

Data in Table 4 indicates that "parents" were the most influential persons affecting the decision of graduates to earn a degree from Texas A&M with a mean of 3.21. "A former or contemporary A&M student" was second most influential with a mean response of 3.12, "friends" were ranked third; and "teachers of vocational agriculture," fourth with means of 2.98 and 2.85, respectively. Again, high school counselors were the least influential with a mean score of 1.34.

Table 4. Degree of Influence Persons Had on Graduate's Decision to Earn Degree from Texas A&M University

Person	Mean Response*			
	Overall N=186	Teachers N=40	Former Teachers N=52	Non-Teachers N=94
Parents	3.21	3.35	3.08	3.22
Former or Contemporary A&M Student	3.12	2.98	3.17	3.20
Friends	2.98	2.90	2.75	3.11
Vocational Agriculture Teacher	2.85	3.30	2.67	2.76
Relatives	2.54	2.45	2.52	2.60
College Faculty Member	1.99	2.15	1.90	1.92
County Agent	1.74	1.53	1.85	1.78
High School Teacher (Not Voc. Agri.)	1.73	1.63	1.58	1.90
High School Counselor	1.34	1.25	1.33	1.39

*5 = supreme; 1 = none

Teachers and non-teachers ranked "parents" as most influential in their decision to earn a degree from Texas A&M with means of 3.35 and 3.22, respectively. However, "a former or contemporary A&M student" was ranked most influential by the former teacher group. Although the above were rated most influential, Table 4 shows that the influence of "friends," "relatives," "vocational agriculture teachers" and "college faculty members" were important in influencing students to earn a degree from Texas A&M. "County

extension agents," "high school teacher (not voc. agri.)" and "high school counselors" were not remembered by most graduates as influencing their decision to any great extent.

Factors Influencing Graduates

Factors Influencing Graduates to Earn a Degree from Texas A&M University.

"Good agricultural facilities," "high academic standards," "Aggie spirit," "cost," and "desire of parents" were the factors influencing graduates most to earn a degree from Texas A&M with mean responses, of 4.46, 3.84, 3.48 and

Table 5. Degree of Influence Factors had on Graduate's Decision to Earn Degree from Texas A&M University

Factors	Mean Response*			
	Overall N=186	Teachers N=40	Former Teachers N=52	Non-Teachers N=94
Good agricultural facilities	4.46	4.55	4.63	4.35
High academic standards	3.84	3.73	4.08	3.78
Aggie Spirit	3.48	3.40	3.42	3.52
Cost	2.76	2.80	2.73	2.76
Desire of parents	2.28	2.58	2.10	2.18
Wanted to be with friends	1.84	1.88	1.71	1.88
Corps of Cadets	1.82	1.60	1.87	1.86
Nearness to home	1.76	1.85	1.58	1.76

*5 = supreme, 1 = none

2.76 respectively, as shown in Table 5. It is interesting to note that "nearness to home" and "corps of cadets" were scored relatively low with means of 1.76 and 1.82, respectively.

When data were tabulated by career category for teachers, former teachers, and non-teachers, it was found that "good agricultural facilities" was the most influential factor affecting the decision of each group to earn a degree from A&M, and "high academic standards" was rated second.

Factors Influencing Graduates to Major in Agricultural Education. Many factors must be considered by high school seniors in selecting colleges and college majors, such as specific career goals, job availability after graduation, and the kind of people with whom they would like to work. The factor that had the most influence on graduates to major in agricultural education was "the desire to secure a broad knowledge of scientific agriculture," with a mean of 3.80, as shown in Table 5. "Involvement with FFA and/or 4-H club," "desire to teach vocational agriculture," "opportunities in agribusiness," and "opportunity to work with youth" were also found to be significant factors with means of 3.52, 3.37, 3.35, and 3.26, respectively. Career day presentations had the least influence on the 186 graduates with a mean response of 1.26.

Of the three groups represented in the study, former teachers and non-teachers rated "the desire to secure a broad knowledge of scientific agriculture" first, as shown in Table 6, while teachers rated "the opportunity to work with youth" as the most influential factor in their decision to major in agricultural education.

Table 6. Degree of Influence Factors had on Decision of Graduates to Major in Agricultural Education

Factors	Mean Response*			
	Overall N=186	Teachers N=40	Former Teachers N=52	Non-Teachers N=94
Secure a broad knowledge of scientific agriculture	3.80	3.58	3.87	3.88
Involvement with FFA and/or 4-H Club	3.52	3.70	3.67	3.40
Desire to teach vocational agriculture	3.37	3.78	3.42	3.19
Opportunities in agri-business	3.35	2.95	3.04	3.65
Opportunity to work with youth	3.26	3.83	3.47	2.93
Job security-always easy to find a teaching job	2.54	2.25	2.65	2.55
Desire to be a county agent	2.06	1.73	2.08	2.21
A career day presentation	1.26	1.50	1.13	1.20
Other	1.30	1.18	1.29	1.40

Time of Decision to Major in Agricultural Education

To determine when graduates first decided to major in agricultural education, a question was formulated with the following included: (1) while in high school, (2) between high school and college, (3) during college freshman year, (4) during college sophomore year, and (5) during college junior year and (6) other. Table 7 shows that 33.5 percent of the graduates decided to major in agricultural education when they were in high school. More than 50 percent made the decision while in college. Of these, about one-half decided during their sophomore year. Only 17 or 9.2 percent decided to major in agricultural education between high school and college.

Table 7. When Graduates First Decided to Major in Agricultural Education

Time Frame	Number	Percent
While in High School	62	33.5
During College Sophomore Year	50	27.0
During College Freshman Year	31	16.8
During College Junior Year	18	9.7
Between High School and College	17	9.2
Other	7	3.8
Total	185	100.0

From Where Did Graduates Enter TAMU

As Table 8 indicates, ninety of the 185 graduates responding to this question or 48.7 percent, entered Texas A&M from high school; while 87 or 47.0 percent, entered from another college, usually a junior college. Only 2 or 1.1 percent of the respondents entered A&M from the military and 5 or 2.7 percent began after leaving a full-time job.

Table 8. From Where Did Graduate Enter Texas A&M University

Entry Source	Frequency Distribution	Percent
From high school	90	48.7
From another college (mostly from community college)	87	47.0
From military service	2	1.1
From full-time (non-summer) job	5	2.7
Other	1	0.5
Total	185	100.0

Major Occupation of Supporting Parent of Graduates

Table 9 shows the major occupation of the supporting parent of graduates when they entered college. More parents of graduates, 84, or 45.4 percent, were fulltime farmer/ranchers than any other single occupation. The second greatest number, 68 or 36.7 percent, were employed in non-agricultural occupations. Some of the non-agricultural occupations of parents written in by the respondents were: oil industry, telephone company, electricians, barbers, Texas Highway Department, retail meat market, contractors, auditor, real estate agent, bookkeeper, and nurse.

Table 9. Major Occupation of Supporting Parent of Graduates

Occupation	Frequency Distribution	Percent
Full Time Farmer/Rancher	84	45.2
Non-Agricultural Occupation	68	36.6
Agribusiness Occupation	15	8.1
Farmer/Ranch Employee	9	4.7
Vocational Agriculture Teacher	7	3.8
Government Agricultural Worker (USDA, SCS, TAEX)	3	1.6
Total	186	100.0

Seven of the 186 respondents were children of vocational agriculture teachers. Table 10 compares the major occupation of the parents among the career categories of graduates. Surprisingly, fifty percent of the graduates who were teaching vocational agriculture at the time of the study had parents who were working in non-agricultural occupations. Of the non-teacher graduates, approximately 49 percent had parents who were full-time farmers and ranchers, compared to about 54 percent of the former teachers.

Table 10. Major Occupation of the Parents When Graduates Entered College

	Respondents Career Categories					
	Teachers		Former Teachers		Non-Teachers	
Parent's Occupation	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Farmer/Rancher	10	25.0	28	53.9	46	48.9
Voc. Ag. Teacher	3	7.5	1	1.9	3	3.2
Governmental Ag Worker	0	0	1	1.9	2	2.1
Agribusiness	4	10.0	5	9.6	6	6.5
Farm/Ranch Employee	3	7.5	1	1.9	5	5.3
Non-agriculture	20	50.0	16	30.8	32	34.0
Total	40	100.0	52	100.0	94	100.0

Post Graduate Education of Respondents

When asked about the level of post graduate education earned, 74 or 40.0 percent held the master's degree; while 11 or 5.9 percent had earned the

doctorate. Thirty-eight or 20.6 percent had some graduate credit but 60 or 32.4 percent had never enrolled for post graduate work, as shown in Table 11.

Table 11. Post Graduate Education of Graduates

Level	Occupational Classification							
	Teachers		Former Teachers		Non-Teachers		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
No graduate work	4	10.0	12	23.1	44	47.3	60	32.4
Some graduate work	14	33.5	11	21.1	18	19.4	38	20.6
Master's Degree	22	56.5	26	50.0	21	22.6	74	40.0
PhD Degree	0	0	3	5.8	8	8.5	11	5.9
Other (Veterinarian)	0	0	0	0	2	2.2	2	1.1
Total	40	100.0	52	100.0	93	100.0	185	100.0

The highest percentage of master's degrees were held by teachers followed closely by former teachers with percentages of 56.5 and 50.0, respectively. Twenty-one or 22.6 percent of the 93 non-teachers responding had earned a masters degree. Three former teachers and eight non-teachers had earned a Ph.D. degree, while two non-teachers held the DVM degree.

Almost one-half, 47.3 percent, of those who had earned no graduate credit were in the non-teacher category compared to 23.1 percent of former teachers and 10.0 percent of teachers. Of those who had taken some graduate work, but who had not earned a degree, the highest percentage was among teachers followed in order by non-teachers and former teachers.

Graduates' Opinion of Agricultural Education

When asked "if it were possible for you to start college over, would you again major in Agricultural Education?", 110 graduates or 59.2 percent responded they would and only 39 or 20.9 percent answered they would not choose the same major, as shown in Table 12.

Table 12. If Possible to Start College Over, Would Graduates Major in Agricultural Education Again?

Respondents	Yes		No		Undecided		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Vocational Agriculture Teacher	36	90.0	2	5.0	2	5.0	40	100.0
Former Teachers	31	59.6	10	19.2	11	21.2	52	100.0
Non-Teachers	43	45.7	27	28.7	24	25.6	94	100.0
Total	110	59.2	39	20.9	37	19.9	186	100.0

Of those graduates who responded "no" or "undecided" to the question, most commented they would major in other fields such as agronomy, veterinary medicine, meats science, agricultural economics, or horticulture. Breaking the total group down by career category, 90.0 percent of the teachers, 59.6 percent of the former teachers, and 45.7 percent of the non-teachers answered they would major in agricultural education again.

The graduates were then requested to answer "yes", "no", or "undecided", with space available for comments, to the following question: "Based on your experiences, would you recommend that a high school student major in

agricultural education?" Of 186 respondents, 148 or 80.0 percent answered "yes", as shown in Table 13. Seven of the graduates, or 3.8 percent, responded "no". Some comments submitted included: "Good general agricultural degree," "only if he wanted to teach," "if student is more interested in teaching than in agriculture," and "no, pay scale of teacher is too low."

Table 13. Would Graduates Recommend Agricultural Education for Major to High School Student

Response	Frequency Distribution	Percent
Yes	148	80.0
No	7	3.8
Undecided	30	16.2
Total	185	100.0

To find out how helpful respondents felt the agricultural education faculty were, graduates were asked to rate the department by checking "very helpful," "helpful," "seldom helpful," or "never helpful." Table 14 indicates that a majority of the graduates, 63.2 percent, thought the faculty was very helpful and 31.9 percent thought the faculty was "seldom helpful." None thought they were "never helpful."

Comments included: "I don't think you can find any better anywhere," "as helpful as possible," "best group of people in the business," "outstanding," and "offer encouragement and are helpful."

Table 14. How Helpful Were Agricultural Education Faculty?

Response	Frequency Distribution	Percent
Very helpful	117	63.2
Helpful	59	31.9
Seldom Helpful	9	4.9
Never Helpful	0	0
Total	185	100.0

Changes Graduates Believe Should Be Made In Course Areas

Section II of the data interpretation and analysis deals with changes graduates felt should be made in particular course areas. The graduates were instructed to circle (1) if they thought hours should be increased in the course area, (2) if course hours should remain the same, and (3) if course hours should be decreased. For those courses not usually taken by agricultural education majors the graduates were asked to circle (1) if the course area should be added, (2) if the course area should not be added, or (3) if undecided. Table 15 indicates the percentages and numbers of total graduates that responded to each of the choices. A statistical breakdown of the three career categories is given in Tables 16, 17, and 18.

Agricultural Economics. A majority of graduates, 59.7 percent, felt that the number of hours of agricultural economics in the curriculum was adequate. However, almost one-third, 32.6 percent, thought more semester hours should be added while 14 or 7.7 percent believed the required hours should be decreased, as shown in Table 15.

Table 15. Changes Graduates Believe Should Be Made in Course Areas (N=181)

Required or Recommended Elective Course Areas	Responses: Should be Increased		Should Remain the Same		Should Be Decreased	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Ag Economics	59	32.6	108	59.7	14	7.7
Ag Education	30	16.6	134	74.0	17	9.4
Agronomy	55	30.3	119	65.8	7	3.9
Ag Engineering	60	33.2	113	62.4	8	4.4
Animal Science	67	37.0	110	60.8	4	2.2
Entomology	48	26.5	128	70.7	5	2.8
Horticulture	86	47.5	88	48.6	7	3.9
Poultry Science	38	21.0	132	72.9	11	6.1
Range Science	39	21.5	128	70.7	14	7.8
Biology	16	8.8	146	80.7	19	10.5
Chemistry	9	5.0	116	64.1	56	30.9
English	16	8.8	123	67.9	42	23.3
Mathematics	21	11.6	134	74.0	26	14.4
Edu. Curr. & Inst.	31	17.1	117	64.7	33	18.2
Ed. Psychology	24	13.3	115	63.5	42	23.2

Table 16. Changes Teachers Believe Should Be Made In Course Areas (N=40)

Required or Recommended Elective Course Areas	Responses					
	Should be Increased		Should Remain the Same		Should Be Decreased	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Ag Economics	6	15.0	32	80.0	2	5.0
Ag Education	8	20.0	30	75.0	2	5.0
Agronomy	12	30.0	25	62.5	3	7.5
Ag Engineering	16	40.0	24	60.0	0	0
Animal Science	21	52.5	19	47.5	0	0
Entomology	12	30.0	27	67.5	1	2.5
Horticulture	19	47.5	19	47.5	2	5.0
Poultry Science	8	20.0	31	77.5	1	2.5
Range Science	6	15.0	30	75.0	4	10.0
Biology	1	2.5	34	85.0	5	12.5
Chemistry	2	5.0	25	62.5	13	32.5
English	1	2.5	27	67.5	12	30.0
Mathematics	5	12.5	27	67.5	8	20.0
Edu. Curr. & Inst.	5	12.5	24	60.0	11	27.5
Ed. Psychology	4	10.0	24	60.0	12	30.0

Table 17. Changes Former Teachers Believe Should Be Made In Course Areas (N=52)

Required or Recommended Elective Course Areas	Responses					
	Should be Increased		Should Remain the Same		Should Be Decreased	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Ag Economics	17	32.7	29	55.8	6	11.5
Ag Education	8	15.4	38	73.1	6	11.5
Agronomy	13	25.0	37	71.2	2	3.8
Ag Engineering	21	40.4	30	57.7	1	1.9
Animal Science	20	38.4	30	57.7	2	3.9
Entomology	11	21.2	39	75.0	2	3.8
Horticulture	24	46.2	26	50.0	2	3.8
Poultry Science	14	26.9	34	65.4	4	7.7
Range Science	12	23.0	38	73.2	2	3.8
Biology	2	3.8	44	84.6	6	11.6
Chemistry	2	3.9	32	61.5	18	34.6
English	5	9.6	37	71.2	10	19.2
Mathematics	5	9.6	41	80.8	5	9.6
Edu. Curr. & Inst.	8	15.4	37	71.2	7	13.4
Ed. Psychology	7	13.5	31	59.6	14	26.9

Table 18. Changes Non-Teachers Believe Should be Made in Course Areas (N=94)

Required or Recommended Elective Course Areas	Responses					
	Should be Increased		Should Remain the Same		Should Be Decreased	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Ag Economics	36	38.3	52	55.3	6	6.4
Ag Education	14	14.9	71	75.5	9	9.6
Agronomy	30	31.9	62	66.0	2	2.1
Ag Engineering	23	24.5	64	68.1	7	7.4
Animal Science	26	27.7	66	70.2	2	2.1
Entomology	25	26.6	67	71.3	2	2.1
Horticulture	43	45.7	48	51.1	3	3.2
Poultry Science	16	17.0	72	76.6	6	6.4
Range Science	21	22.4	65	69.1	8	8.5
Biology	13	13.8	73	77.7	8	8.5
Chemistry	5	5.3	64	68.1	25	26.6
English	10	10.6	64	68.1	20	21.3
Mathematics	11	11.7	70	74.5	13	13.8
Edu. Curr. & Inst.	16	17.0	61	64.9	17	18.1
Ed. Psychology	13	13.9	60	63.8	21	22.3

When data were analyzed by career category, 80 percent of the teachers were of the opinion that the number of hours of agricultural economics should remain the same as compared to 55.8 percent of former teachers and 55.3 percent of non-teachers, as may be seen in Tables 16, 17, and 18.

When compared to teachers, far more former teachers and non-teachers thought the number of hours of agricultural economics should be increased with percentages of 15.0, 32.6, and 38.3, respectively.

Agricultural Education. Almost three-fourths of respondents thought the number of hours of agricultural education should remain the same while 16.6 percent felt the hours should be increased. Only 17 or 9.4 percent thought a decrease was needed, as shown in Table 15.

Analysis of data by career category shows that 75.0 percent of teachers, 73.1 percent of former teachers, and 75.5 percent of non-teachers were of the opinion that the number of hours of agricultural education should remain the same, as shown in Tables 16, 17, and 18.

Agronomy. A great deal of freedom is given students in their choice in selecting the 12 hours of courses classified as agronomy. Therefore, it is impossible to know specifically what graduates had in mind when they responded to the item. However, it may be observed in Table 15 that 65.8 percent thought the number of hours of agronomy should remain the same; 30.3 percent recommended an increase while only 3.9 percent thought a decrease was justified.

A comparison of responses among the three career categories shows about two-thirds of each group--teachers, former teachers, and non-teachers--thought the hours of agronomy should remain the same. Less than one-third thought the hours should be increased while less than 10 percent recommended a decrease, as may be seen in Tables 16, 17, and 18.

Agricultural Engineering. Nine hours of agricultural engineering are required for certification of teachers of vocational agriculture, yet, approximately one-third, 33.2 percent of graduates thought the hours of agricultural engineering in the curriculum should be increased with only 4.4 percent suggesting a decrease. However, 62.4 percent of all graduates believed the hours should remain the same, as shown in Table 15.

Approximately the same percentage of teachers and former teachers, 40.0 and 40.4 respectively, thought the hours should be increased. However, slightly less than one-fourth, 24.5 percent, of the non-teacher group indicated a need for more agricultural engineering, as shown in Tables 16, 17, and 18.

Almost the same percentage of teachers and former teachers, 60.0 and 57.7 percent respectively, thought the hours should remain the same, compared to 68.1 percent of the non-teachers. A very small percentage of any group suggested a decrease in the required hours of agricultural engineering.

Animal Science. Approximately 61 percent of graduates were of the opinion that the nine hours of animal science required in the agricultural education curriculum should remain the same. However, 37 percent suggested that requirement be increased with only 2.2 percent believing a decrease in requirements to be in order, as may be seen in Table 15.

An analysis by career category shows that a much lower percentage of teachers were satisfied with the hours of animal science, 47.5 percent, than former teachers, 57.7 percent, or non-teachers with 70.2 percent. Less than five percent of any group suggested the hours be decreased, as shown in Tables 16, 17, and 18.

It is interesting to note that more than 50 percent of teachers thought the hours of animal science should be increased compared with 38.4 percent of former teachers and 27.7 percent of non-teachers.

Entomology. Over 70 percent of the respondents thought the number of hours of entomology were adequate, while 26.5 percent responded that the hours should be increased. Only 5 or 2.8 percent of graduates felt the hours of entomology should be decreased, as shown in Table 15.

The teachers held the strongest opinion that hours should be increased with 30.0 percent, as compared to 21.2 percent of the former teachers and 26.6 percent of the non-teachers, as may be seen in Tables 16, 17, and 18.

Horticulture. Although horticulture is optional in the agricultural education curriculum, more graduates called for increased hours in horticulture than for any other course area listed in the questionnaire. Almost half or 47.5 percent of the graduates felt that more hours should be devoted to this course area, and 88 or 48.6 percent thought hours should remain the same. Only 7 or 3.9 percent of respondents thought the hours should be decreased, as shown in Table 15.

Surprisingly, the graduates in all career categories felt strongly that hours of horticulture should be increased. As may be seen in Tables 16, 17, and 18, 47.5 percent of the teachers, 46.2 percent of the former teachers, and 45.7 percent of the non-teachers were of the opinion that the hours of horticulture should be increased.

Poultry Science. As shown in Table 15, 132 or 72.9 percent of the graduates thought the hours of poultry science should remain the same, as compared to 38 or 21 percent who felt hours should be increased. Only 11 or 6.1 percent felt the number of hours should be decreased.

When data were analyzed by career category, it was found that the three groups basically agreed that the hours of poultry science should remain the same, according to 77.5 percent of the teachers, 65.4 percent of the former teachers, and 76.6 percent of the non-teachers, as shown in Tables 16, 17, and 18.

Range Science. Almost three-fourths of the graduates, 70.7 percent, felt that the number of hours of range science in the curriculum were adequate to fulfill their career needs. In comparison, 39 or 21.5 percent thought more semester hours should be added while 14 or 7.8 percent thought the range science hours should be decreased, as shown in Table 15.

As may be seen in Tables 16, 17, and 18, 15 percent of the teachers, 23 percent of the former teachers, and 22.4 percent of the non-teachers thought the hours should be increased. Ten percent of the teachers felt the hours of range science should be decreased while 8.5 percent of the non-teachers and only 3.8 percent of the former teachers suggested a decrease in hours of range science.

Biology. For some years all undergraduate agricultural education students have been required to take at least six credit hours of biology. One hundred and forty-six or 80.7 percent of the graduates felt the hours of biology they had taken were adequate to meet their needs while 19 or

10.5 percent felt the number should be decreased. Only 16 or 8.8 percent thought hours should be increased, as may be seen in Table 15.

Thirteen or 13.8 percent of the non-teachers felt that hours should be increased, but only 3.8 percent and 2.5 percent of the former teachers and teachers, respectively, felt the number of hours should be increased. In addition, only 8.5 percent of the non-teachers thought biology hours should be decreased as compared to 12.5 percent of the teachers and 11.6 percent of the former teachers.

Chemistry. Even though only eight hours of chemistry are required to earn a B.S. degree in agricultural education, almost one-third, 30.9 percent, of the respondents thought that less hours of chemistry should be required, while 5.0 percent felt the hours should be increased. However, almost two-thirds or 64.1 percent of graduates felt the hours should remain the same. The former teachers expressed the strongest opinion in favor of decreasing hours of chemistry, 34.6 percent, followed by the teachers, 32.5 percent, and 26.6 percent of the non-teacher group.

English. As can be seen in Table 15, more than two-thirds of the respondents or 67.9 percent felt that hours of English should remain the same, but 23.3 percent thought hours should be decreased. Only 16 or 8.8 percent of the graduates called for increased hours of English.

Approximately the same percentage of teachers and non-teachers, 67.5 and 68.1 respectively, thought hours should remain the same, while 71.2 percent of the former teachers felt the number of hours of English were adequate. Only 2.5 percent of the teachers, 9.6 percent of the former teachers

and 10.6 percent of the non-teachers suggested the requirement be increased, as shown in Tables 16, 17, and 18.

Mathematics. In general, the graduates felt that the mathematics courses they had taken were sufficient to meet their needs as shown when almost three-fourths or 74.0 percent responded that the hours of mathematics should remain the same.

Few of the graduates saw any need for increased mathematics because only 11.7 percent of the non-teachers, 9.6 percent of the former teachers, and 12.5 percent of the teachers thought that the hours of mathematics taken should be increased. As may be seen in Tables 16, 17, and 18, 13.8 percent of non-teachers and 20.0 percent of the teachers were of the opinion that the number of hours should be decreased, compared to 9.6 percent of the former teachers.

Educational Curriculum and Instruction. Three credit hours of Educational Curriculum and Instruction are required for Texas A&M students seeking a vocational agriculture teaching certificate. As can be seen in Table 15, 64.7 percent of the graduates felt the educational curriculum and instruction course they had taken was adequate to meet their career needs, however, 18.2 percent thought the required hours should be decreased.

It is interesting to note that teachers held the strongest opinion in favor of decreasing required hours of Educational Curriculum and Instruction with a 27.5 percent response as compared to non-teachers and former teachers with 18.1 and 13.4 percentages, respectively. In addition, only 60.0 percent of the teachers were of the opinion that hours should remain the same, while

71.2 percent of the former teachers and 64.9 percent of the non-teachers held the same opinion.

Educational Psychology. Almost two-thirds or 63.5 percent of the respondents felt the hours of educational psychology should remain the same, as may be seen in Table 15. Although three hours are required, 23.2 percent of the graduates thought the number of hours should be decreased, compared to 13.3 percent who felt hours should be increased.

When data were analyzed by career category, 63.8 percent of the non-teachers were of the opinion that hours should remain the same compared to 60.0 percent and 59.6 percent of the teachers and former teachers respectively, as can be seen in Tables 16, 17, and 18.

Course Areas Graduates Believe Should or Should Not Be Included in the Agricultural Education Curriculum

The course areas dealt with in this section are not normally included in the agricultural education curriculum, but because of the diversity and flexibility of the curriculum, some students do enroll in courses in these areas. Consequently, graduates were requested to indicate if selected course areas should be added to curricular requirements.

Business Management. As shown in Table 19, 108 or 59.7 percent of respondents felt that business management should be added to the agricultural education curriculum, compared to 62 or 34.2 percent who thought it should not be added.

Table 19. Additional Course Areas Graduates Believe Should or Should Not Be Included in the Agricultural Education Curriculum

Course Areas	Responses: Should Be Added Number	Should Be Added Percent	Should Not Be Added Number	Should Not Be Added Percent	Undecided Number	Undecided Percent	Total
Business Management							
Teachers	15	37.5	20	50.0	5	12.5	40
Former Teachers	34	65.4	15	28.8	3	5.8	52
Non-Teachers	59	66.3	27	30.3	3	3.4	89
Total Graduates	108	59.7	62	34.2	11	6.1	181
Journalism							
Teachers	11	27.5	26	65.0	3	7.5	40
Former Teachers	24	46.2	24	46.2	4	7.6	52
Non-Teachers	22	24.7	62	69.7	5	5.6	89
Total Graduates	57	31.5	112	61.9	12	6.6	181
Speech							
Teachers	20	50.0	18	45.0	2	5.0	40
Former Teachers	29	55.8	21	40.4	2	3.8	52
Non-Teachers	46	48.9	42	44.7	6	6.4	94
Total Graduates	95	51.1	81	43.5	10	5.4	186
Technical Writing							
Teachers	14	35.0	22	55.0	4	10.0	40
Former Teachers	19	36.5	29	55.8	4	7.7	52
Non-Teachers	33	35.1	51	54.3	10	10.6	94
Total Graduates	66	35.5	102	54.8	18	9.7	186

The non-teachers and former teachers felt strongly that hours should be added as indicated by 66.3 and 65.4 percent, respectively. However, only 37.5 percent of the teachers were of the opinion that courses in business management should be added with another 12.5 percent undecided, as shown in Table 19.

Journalism. Journalism is not a required course in the agricultural education curriculum, but many students substitute Agricultural Journalism 350 for three hours of required English. Fifty-seven or 31.5 percent of the respondents thought journalism should be added to the curriculum, but 112 or 61.9 percent felt additional hours were not needed.

Of the three career categories, the former teachers felt the strongest about adding journalism with a 46.2 percent response compared to only 24.7 percent of the non-teachers and 27.5 percent of the teachers, as may be seen in Table 19.

Speech. Of the total group, 95 or 51.1 percent of respondents were of the opinion that speech should be added to the curriculum, 81 or 43.5 percent felt it should not be added, and 10 or 5.4 percent were undecided, as shown in Table 19.

Over half of the former teachers or 55.8 percent thought speech should be included while 50.0 and 48.9 percent of the teachers and non-teachers, respectively, felt the same way.

Technical Writing. In general the graduates were of the opinion that technical writing should not be added to the agricultural education curriculum, but 9.7 percent were undecided.

An analysis by career category shows that about the same percentage of teachers, non-teachers, and former teachers felt technical writing should not be included in the curriculum as indicated by 55.0, 54.3, and 55.8 percent responses, respectively. In addition, 10.0 percent of the teachers, 7.7 percent of the former teachers, and 10.6 percent of the non-teachers were undecided, as shown in Table 19.

Career Patterns of Teachers

Data were obtained from those graduates who were teaching at the time of the study or who had ever filled a teaching position. Views of vocational agriculture teachers, former teachers, and non-vocational agriculture teachers are represented in this portion of the report.

Factors That Influenced Graduates To Enter Teaching

The factor that had the greatest degree of influence on graduates to enter teaching was the opportunity of "working with youth" with a mean of 4.05 followed closely by "student teaching experience," as shown in Table 20. The factors of "job security," "prestige in the community," "working hours," and "salary level," had much less influence on graduates to enter teaching with means of 2.83, 2.67, 2.26 and 2.06, respectively. A few indicated that they were unable to find a non-teaching job but the mean for the factor was only 1.29 for the 92 respondents. It is evident, therefore, that almost all entered teaching as a first career choice.

Table 20. Degree Of Influence Factors Had On Graduates' Decision To Enter The Teaching Profession

Factor	Mean Response*
Work with youth	4.05
Student teaching experience	3.27
Job security	2.83
Prestige in community	2.67
Working hours	2.26
Salary level	2.06
Opportunity to live close to relatives	1.83
Could not find non-teaching job	1.29

*5 - supreme, 1 = none (n = 92)

Number of Teaching Positions Held

As shown in Table 21, the 40 teachers had held an average of 1.84 teaching positions compared to 1.67 for former teachers. It is evident, therefore, that the mobility of teachers among schools is rather limited and that those who drop out of teaching tend to enter non-teaching employment from the school where they were initially employed. Also, it may be observed in the table that those who dropped out of teaching had taught a mean of 4.37 years.

Table 21. Number of Teaching Positions Held

	Mean Number
Teachers n = 40	1.84
Former teachers n = 52	1.67
Years before dropping out of teaching	4.37

Contact With First Employer

For many years the Department of Agricultural Education has assisted graduates in finding employment and the evidence in this study shows a high degree of success in this endeavor. As shown in Table 22, 56 or almost 61 percent of those who entered teaching made their first contact with their initial employer through the Department. Friends were given credit by 18 or 19.6 percent of the 92 that entered teaching. Others listed by 15.2 percent of the teachers and former teachers were "relative," "uncle," "an . . in-law," and by "employers." Only four or less than five percent made contact with their first employer through the University Placement Office.

Table 22. Contact with First Employer

Contacting Agency or Person	Frequency	Percent
Agricultural Education Department	56	60.9
Friend	18	19.6
University Placement Office	4	4.3
Other	14	15.2

n = 92

What Teachers Liked Most About Teaching

As indicated in Table 23, the thing teachers liked most about teaching was "working with youth," with a 59.9 percent response, while 16 of the 92 respondents, or 17.4 percent, answered they liked the "sense of accomplishment" of teaching most. "Pay" and "lack of pressure" were rated lowest with only one of the graduates responding they liked the pay scale best.

Table 23. What Teachers Liked Most About Teaching

Factor	Frequency	Percent
Working with youth	55	59.9
Sense of accomplishment	16	17.4
Working hours	7	7.6
Being able to stay close to home	4	4.3
Security	4	4.3
Other	4	4.3
Lack of pressure	1	1.1
Pay	1	1.1
Total	92	100.0

What Teachers Disliked Most About Teaching

When asked what they disliked most about teaching, 34 of the 92 respondents, or 36.9 percent answered the "salary level," and twenty-one of the graduates, or 22.8 percent responded they had "no serious dislikes." "Lack of advancement opportunity" was rated as the aspect disliked most by 10.9 percent of the

graduates. Rated relatively low were "community pressures" and "pressure of meeting classes every day," with percentages of 3.3 and 2.2, respectively, as shown in Table 24.

Table 24. What Graduates Disliked Most About Teaching

Factor	Frequency	Percent
Salary level	34	36.9
No serious dislikes	21	22.8
Lack of advancement opportunity	10	10.9
Discipline problem	8	8.7
Working hours	7	7.6
School administration	7	7.6
Community pressures	3	3.3
Pressure of meeting classes every day	2	2.2
Low prestige	0	0
Total	92	100.0

Career Patterns of Former Teachers

Section C of the questionnaire was to be answered by those graduates who had left high school teaching. An attempt was made to determine the reasons they left teaching, what jobs they held after leaving, and if their teaching experiences were of any aid to them in their present employment.

Factors That Influenced Graduates to Leave Teaching

As Table 25 indicates, the principal reason the 52 former teachers left the teaching field was that they felt the salary level was too low. Another important factor was that they had "opportunities to enter a more interesting profession." Surprisingly, "long working hours of teaching," "problems with school administrators," and "poor teaching facilities" were all rated relatively low with mean responses of 1.81, 1.85, and 1.70, respectively. The factor that had the least influence on former teachers to leave the profession was the "desire to move closer to their or their wife's original home," with a mean of 1.48.

Table 25. Degree of Influence Factors Had on Graduate's Decision to Leave Teaching

Factor	Mean Response
Salary level	3.23
Enter a more interesting profession	2.88
Discipline problems in school	1.92
Disillusioned with teaching	1.88
Problems with school administrators	1.85
Long working hours	1.81
Poor teaching facilities	1.70
Wanted to move closer to home (or wife's home)	1.48

Jobs After Leaving Teaching

Twenty-five percent of the former teachers entered occupations other than those listed in the questionnaire, as shown in Table 26. The graduates were requested to write in their occupation if it was not listed. Some of the occupations submitted were minister, oil industry worker, banker, and attorney. Nine of the 52 former teachers began farming, seven acquired jobs in agribusiness, seven obtained jobs at a university level, seven more became school administrators, and only one entered the military after leaving teaching.

Table 26. Former Teachers First Job After Leaving Teaching

Occupation	Frequency	Percent
Farming/ranching	9	17.3
Agribusiness	7	13.5
School administration	7	13.5
University	7	13.5
Texas Agricultural Extension Service	4	7.7
Soil Conservation Service	2	3.8
Governmental Position	2	3.8
Military	1	1.9
Other	13	25.0
Total	52	100.0

Annual Gross Salary of Graduates

The annual gross salary earned by the 52 former teachers in their first job after leaving teaching is shown in Table 27. The largest percentage, 19.2 percent, started at salaries below $6,000 which was probably less than they received while teaching. However, this figure is slightly skewed because four of these 10 persons went back to graduate school, probably supported only by a graduate assistantship. Eight graduates quit teaching to enter jobs where they received a $7,000-$7,999 salary. Two former teachers entered jobs which payed $25,000 or more per year.

Breaking the 52 former teachers jobs into occupational classifications, those who entered agribusiness had a median salary of $11,225 annually, while those who went to work for the Texas Agricultural Extension Service started at salaries of about $8,000, on the average. Former teachers who entered school administration had slightly higher median salaries than the other groups, about $12,500. Those who entered a non-agricultural field of employment started at varied salaries with one graduate earning over $25,000.

Table 28 shows the annual gross salaries of the former teachers in their occupations at the time of the study. Compared with salary levels of the first job after leaving teaching, it can be seen that the median salary of the former teachers had increased to about $18,000. Only one of the 49 had a salary of less than $6,000. Of those whose jobs were the same as the one after leaving teaching, three were earning more than $25,000 per year, and

TABLE 27. Annual Gross Salary of Former Teachers in First Occupation After Graduation by Occupational Areas

Annual Gross Salary	Farmer-Rancher		Agri-business		Governmental		Agricultural Extension		School Administration		University		Other		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Below 6,000	1	1.9	0	0	2	3.9	1	1.9	1	1.9	4	7.7	1	1.9	10	19.2
6,000-6,999	2	3.9	0	0	0	0	1	1.9	0	0	0	0	4	7.7	7	13.5
7,000-7,999	1	1.9	1	1.9	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1.9	5	9.6	8	15.3
8,000-8,999	1	1.9	0	0	0	0	2	3.9	0	0	0	0	2	3.9	5	9.7
9,000-9,999	0	0	1	1.9	1	1.9	0	0	1	1.9	1	1.9	1	1.9	5	9.5
10,000-12,499	1	1.9	2	3.9	0	0	0	0	1	1.9	0	0	1	1.9	5	9.6
12,500-14,999	0	0	3	5.8	1	1.9	0	0	2	3.9	0	0	0	0	6	11.6
15,000-19,999	1	1.9	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1.9	1	1.9	1	1.9	4	7.7
20,000-24,999	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
25,000-Over	1	1.9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1.9	2	3.9
TOTALS	8	15.4	7	13.5	4	7.7	4	7.7	6	11.5	7	13.4	16	30.8	52	100.0

TABLE 28. Annual Gross Salary of Former Teachers in Present Occupation by Occupational Areas

Annual Gross Salary	Same As First Job		Agri-business		Governmental		School Administrator		University		Other		Totals	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Below 6,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2.0	0	0	1	2.0
6,000-6,999	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7,000-7,999	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8,000-8,999	2	4.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4.1
9,000-9,999	3	6.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	6.1
10,000-12,499	2	4.1	0	0	0	0	2	4.1	1	2.0	0	0	5	10.2
12,500-14,999	8	16.4	0	0	1	2.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	18.4
15,000-19,999	8	16.4	2	4.1	0	0	0	0	1	2.0	3	6.1	14	28.6
20,000-24,999	5	10.3	3	6.1	0	0	1	2.0	0	0	2	4.1	11	22.5
25,000-Over	3	6.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2.0	4	8.1
TOTALS	31	63.5	5	10.2	1	2.0	3	6.1	3	6.0	6	12.2	49	100.0

five were earning between $20,000 and $24,999 annually. Overall, 28.6 percent of the former teachers were earning between $15,000 and $19,999 annually and 22.4 percent were earning $20,000-$24,999.

The Extent Teaching Experience Helped Graduates in Current Job

When questioned as to what extent teaching experience had helped former teachers in their present jobs, 45.1 percent responded their teaching experience was of "tremendous help to them," 25.4 percent responded "much help" 27.5 percent answered "some help," and only one of the 51 respondents said the experience was of "no help" as shown in Table 29.

Table 29. Extent Teaching Experience Helped Graduates in Current Job

Extent	Number	Percent
Tremendous help	23	45.1
Much help	13	25.4
Some help	14	27.5
No help	1	2.0
Total	51	100.0

Career Patterns of Non-Teachers

In an attempt to determine what influenced non-teaching graduates not to enter teaching, and to determine other career information about them, section D of the questionnaire was developed. As stated before, the non-teachers

included those graduates who had never taught, disregarding their student teaching experience.

Degree of Influence Factors Had on Non-Teacher's Decision Not to Enter Teaching

The most influential factor in the decision of non-teachers not to teach was that they "found a more interesting profession," with a 3.47 mean response as shown in Table 30. Another significant factor which contributed to the graduates decision was that they felt the salary level was too low. Factors rated relatively low were "could not find a suitable teaching job," "prestige too low," and "wife against it," with mean responses of 1.58, 1.35, and 1.07, respectively.

Table 30. Influence Factors Had on Non-Teacher's Decision Not to Enter Teaching Profession

Factor	Mean Response *
Found a more interesting profession	3.47
Salary level too low	2.81
Military obligations	2.06
Wanted to enter full-time farming	1.76
Could not find suitable teaching job	1.58
Prestige too low	1.35
Wife (or husband) was against it	1.07

* 5 = supreme, 1 = none

When Graduate Decided Not To Teach

As shown in Table 31, the exact time period when the non-teacher graduates decided not to teach is well distributed. Thirty-one of the 94 graduates, or 33.0 percent, decided not to teach after they started job hunting, 14 never intended to teach, 14 had decided before student teaching, and 14 graduates decided not to teach during student teaching. Twenty-one made the decision while in the military.

Table 31. When Graduate Decided Not to Teach

Time Period	Frequency	Percent
After starting job hunting	31	33.0
While in military	21	22.3
Never intended to teach	14	14.9
Before student teaching	14	14.9
During student teaching	14	14.9
Totals	94	100.0

How Non-Teachers Contacted First Employer

As Table 32 indicates, a majority of the non-teachers, 52.1 percent, first contacted their employer through some person or agency other than those listed on the questionnaire. Representative of the contacts written in by the non-teachers were: "U.S. Army Recruiter," "personal job hunting," "wife's relative," and "private placement agency." Only 18 of the 94 non-teachers, or 19.1 percent, met their employer through the agricultural education department.

Table 32. How Non-Teachers Made Contact with First Employer

Agency or Person	Frequency	Percent
Friend	23	24.5
Agricultural Education Department	18	19.1
University Placement Office	4	4.3
Miscellaneous	49	52.1
Totals	94	100.0

First Job After Graduation

The non-teacher agricultural education majors entered a wide variety of occupations upon graduation, as indicated in Table 33. However, a large

Table 33. Non-Teachers First Job After Graduation

Job	Frequency	Percent
Military	20	21.3
Texas Agricultural Extension Service	20	21.3
Farming/Ranching	11	11.7
Agribusiness	9	9.6
Soil Conservation Service	8	8.5
University	7	7.4
School Administration	2	2.1
Other	17	18.1
Totals	94	100.0

number of the graduates, 48 of 94, were first employed by federal or state governmental agencies such as the Soil Conservation Service, Armed Forces, agricultural extension service, local government, or state supported universities. Over 21.3 percent of the non-teachers entered one of the military services; 21.3 percent entered the Texas Agricultural Extension Service; 11.7 percent began farming or ranching; and 9.6 percent entered employment in agribusiness.

Annual Gross Salary for Non-Teachers First Job

The 94 non-teachers were requested to reveal the level of salary in their first jobs. The salaries ranged from "less than $6,000" to "over $25,000," as shown in Table 34. Twenty-two of the 94 respondents or 23.4 percent, earned less than $6,000 in their first job, and 35.2 percent earned between $6,000 and $7,999 in their initial jobs. Only one of the non-teachers started at a salary of more than $25,000 and this person's occupation was full-time farming. The median starting salary for the non-teaching group was $7,570, which was not significantly greater than the initial salaries of former teachers.

Annual Gross Salary for Non-Teacher's Present Occupations

The median salary for the non-teachers present (at time of the study) job was about $19,000 as compared to $13,000 to $14,000 for teachers and the

TABLE 34. Annual Gross Salary of Non-Teachers in First Occupation after Graduation by Occupational Areas

Salary Level	Military		Texas Agricultural Extension Service		Ranching and Farming		Agri-business		Soil Conservation Service		University		School Administration		Other		Totals	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Below 6,000	6	6.4	2	2.1	1	1.1	3	3.2	5	5.3	2	2.1	0	-	3	3.2	22	23.4
6,000-6,999	8	8.5	3	3.2	0	-	1	1.1	1	1.1	0	-	1	1.1	2	2.1	16	17.1
7,000-7,999	3	3.2	6	6.4	0	-	4	4.2	0	-	0	-	1	1.1	3	3.2	17	18.1
8,000-8,999	0	-	4	4.2	4	4.2	0	-	2	2.1	1	1.1	0	-	2	2.1	13	13.8
9,000-9,999	2	2.1	3	3.2	2	2.1	1	1.1	0	-	2	2.1	0	-	3	3.2	13	13.8
10,000-12,449	0	-	0	-	3	3.2	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	2	2.1	5	5.3
12,500-19,999	0	-	2	2.1	0	-	0	-	0	-	2	2.1	0	-	1	1.1	5	5.3
20,000-24,999	1	1.1	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	1	1.1	2	2.1
25,000-Over	0	-	0	-	1	1.1	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	1	1.1
TOTALS	20	21.3	20	21.2	11	11.7	9	9.6	8	8.5	7	7.4	2	2.2	17	18.1	94	100.0

TABLE 35. Annual Gross Salary of Non-Teachers in Present Occupation by Occupational Areas

Salary Level	Same as First Job		Farming/ ranching		Agri-business		Other		Govern-mental		Texas Ag-cultural Ext. Ser.		University		Totals	
	Num-ber	Per-cent	Num-ber	Per-cent	Num-ber	Per-cent	Num-ber	Per-cent	Num-ber	Per-cent	Num-ber	Per-cent	Num-ber	Per-cent	Num-ber	Per-cent
Below 6,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6,000-6,999	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7,000-7,999	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1.2	1	1.2
8,000-8,999	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2.3
9,000-9,999	1	1.2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1.2
10,000-12,499	1	1.2	1	1.2	1	1.2	3	3.5	1	1.2	0	0	1	1.2	8	9.5
12,500-14,999	3	3.5	1	1.2	1	1.2	0	0	1	1.2	0	0	0	0	6	7.1
15,000-19,999	18	21.1	1	1.2	6	7.1	2	2.3	2	2.3	5	5.9	1	1.2	35	41.1
20,000-24,999	10	11.8	1	1.2	2	2.3	1	1.2	2	2.3	2	2.3	0	0	18	21.1
Over 25,000	6	7.1	0	0	3	3.5	4	4.7	1	1.2	0	0	0	0	14	16.5
TOTALS	39	45.9	4	4.8	13	15.5	12	14.0	7	8.2	7	8.2	3	3.5	85	100.0

$18,000 for the former teachers. As can be seen in Table 35, 41.1 percent of the non-teachers were earning between $15,000 and $19,999 as of January 1977. About 16.5 percent were earning more than $25,000 annually and 21.1 percent earned $10,000-$24,999 a year, which means nearly four-fifths of the non-teachers were earning over $15,000, annually.

Of those non-teachers working for the Texas Agriculture Extension Service, five of the seven graduates were earning $15,000-$19,999 annually. Six of the 13 graduates employed in agribusiness earned $15,000-$19,999. Four of the graduates employed in areas other than agricultural related fields were earning over $25,000 yearly.

How Helpful Was Student Teaching Experience For Non-Teaching Jobs

As shown in Table 36, 22.3 percent of the non-teachers felt their student teaching experience was of "immense help" to them in their current jobs, 29.4 percent indicated "much help," 41.2 percent responded "some help" and 2.4 percent answered their student teaching experience was of "no help."

Table 36. How Helpful Student Teaching Experience was for Graduates in Non-Teaching Jobs

Degree of Usefulness	Frequency	Percent
Immense help	19	22.3
Much help	25	29.4
Some help	35	41.2
No help	2	2.4
Did not student teach	4	4.7
Totals	85	100.0

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The purpose of this study was to determine the effectiveness of the curriculum in agricultural education at Texas A&M University in the preparation of graduates for careers in agriculture and to determine the factors which might influence the choice of and success in either teaching or alternative careers. The following specific objectives served as guidelines for implementing the study:

1. To determine the persons and factors that influenced graduates to earn a degree from Texas A&M University and to select agricultural education as a major field of study.
2. To obtain information to help improve curricular offerings for career preparation.
3. To determine the career patterns of graduates.

Data were obtained from 186 of the 280 questionnaires mailed to agricultural education graduates for the years 1965 through 1971 for a 66.4 percent return. The questionnaire was designed to minimize the number of questions applicable to respondents in different careers and was, therefore, divided into four separate sections:

(A) To be answered by all graduates,

(B) To be answered by all graduates who were teaching or who had taught vocational agriculture at some time,

(C) To be answered by graduates who had entered teaching but later terminated employment as teachers,

(D) To be answered by those graduates who never entered the field of teaching.

On most questions, graduates were requested to rate the item listed on a 5 point scale where 5 represented "supreme influence" and 1 represented "no influence."

Responses from each questionnaire were placed on data processing fortran sheets for computer tabulation. The analysis was based primarily on calculations of means and frequency distributions for overall totals and by career categories.

Results of this study are summarized as follows:

1. Vocational agriculture teachers were clearly the persons most influential in helping graduates choose agricultural education as a major, with a 3.35 mean response. High school counselors had the least influence. The factor that influenced graduates most to major in agricultural education was "the desire to secure a broad knowledge of scientific agriculture." However, "involvement with FFA and/or 4-H club," "desire to teach vocational agriculture" and "opportunities in agribusiness" also had a great deal of influence upon the decision of graduates to major in agricultural education with means of 3.52, 3.37, and 3.35, respectively.
2. The persons most influential in causing graduates to earn a degree from Texas A&M University were "parents," with "former or contemporary A&M students" also exerting a great deal of influence. The most important factors that influenced graduates to earn a degree

from Texas A&M were "good agricultural facilities," "high academic standards," and "Aggie spirit" with means of 4.46, 3.84, and 3.48, respectively.

3. More than 42 percent of the respondents made the decision to major in agricultural education before entering college while the remainder of the graduates decided after beginning college. When asked from where they entered TAMU, 48.7 percent responded that they entered TAMU immediately after graduating from high school, and almost as many, or 47.0 percent, said they entered from another college; most often from a junior college.
4. The leading occupation of the supporting parents of graduates was "full-time farm/ranch operator." Overall, more than 63 percent of the parents of graduates were employed in some agricultural occupation. Surprisingly, the only career category with a majority of parents coming from non-agricultural occupations was vocational agriculture teachers.
5. Forty-seven percent of the total graduates had earned a master's or higher degree. Of the three career categories, teachers had the highest proportion of master's degrees, 56.5 percent, compared to 50 percent of the former teachers. Only 21 of the 93, or 22.6 percent of the non-teachers, had earned a masters degree and 44 or 47.3 percent had taken no graduate work.
6. Several items in the questionnaire were directed toward soliciting the opinions of graduates about agricultural education. When asked if it were possible for them to start college all over, would they

major in agricultural education, 110 graduates or 59.2 percent responded they would, and only 39 or 20.9 percent answered they would not. Ninety percent of the teachers indicated they would repeat their choice of agricultural education as a major. Of the total group, 80 percent would recommend agricultural education as a major to a high school student. The departmental faculty was considered at least "helpful" by 95 percent of the graduates and "very helpful" by 63.2 percent.

7. Regarding recommendations for curricular changes, there was a general tendency to recommend increases without balancing decreases in other areas. Technical agriculture and economic subjects were most often recommended for increases. The non-teacher group favored more business management hours while teachers suggested additional animal science. Several of the courses required for a B.S. degree in agricultural education, such as English, chemistry, and educational psychology, were recommended for reduction. Surprisingly, horticulture was recommended for an increase by more graduates than any other curricular area.
8. The factor that had the greatest degree of influence on graduates to enter the teaching profession was "the opportunity to work with youth," with a mean of 4.05. The greatest dislikes were the "salary level" and "lack of advancement opportunities;" however, 22.8 percent of the teachers responded they had no serious dislikes.
9. The principal reason former teachers left the profession was that they felt the salary level was too low, with a mean of 3.23. After

leaving teaching, the largest percentage, 25.0 percent, entered miscellaneous occupations other than those listed on the questionnaire; slightly more than 12.0 percent went into farming/ranching, 13.5 percent entered agribusiness, 13.5 percent became school administrators, and another 13.5 percent found employment at the university level.

10. The median annual gross salary of the former teachers for their present (at time of study) job was about $18,000, while the annual gross salary of teachers was approximately $14,500.
11. The non-teachers decided not to teach because they found a "more interesting profession" or they felt the "salary level" for teachers was too low, with means of 3.47 and 2.81 respectively.
12. The majority of non-teachers, 52.1 percent, contacted their first employer through some person or agency other than the Agricultural Education Department or the University Placement Services. Contrastingly, 60.9 percent of the teachers made first contact with their employer through an interview arranged by the Agricultural Education Department.
13. The non-teaching graduates entered a wide variety of occupations upon graduation. Over 21 percent entered the military services, 21.3 percent began employment in the Texas Agriculture Extension Service, 11.7 percent began farming/ranching, 9.6 percent went into agribusiness, 8.5 percent began working for the Soil Conservation Service, 7.4 percent took university positions, and 2.1 percent became school administrators. The median annual gross salary for

the non-teachers' initial position after leaving Texas A&M was $7,570, which was not significantly greater than the median salary of the former teacher's first job.

14. Slightly less than half of the non-teachers still hold the same job they had immediately after leaving college. The median salary for the non-teachers present job (at time of study) was about $19,000 as compared to the vocational agriculture teachers with median salaries of $14,500 and $18,000 for the former teachers. Of the 85 non-teachers 14 or 16.5 percent were earning more than $25,000 annually and 21.1 percent earned $20,000-$24,999 a year, which means that nearly 80 percent were earning over $15,000 annually.
15. Nearly 93 percent of the non-teachers found their student teaching experiences to be at least "some help" to them in their present occupations and 22.3 percent found the experiences to be of "immense help."

Conclusions

Based on the data in this study, the following conclusions seem appropriate.

1. Former students are rather well satisfied with their curricular experiences gained in agricultural education at Texas A&M University.
2. Graduates tend to evaluate their college curriculum in light of the occupation in which they are employed at the time a study is conducted.

3. A majority of graduates have a positive attitude toward the department and are glad to provide information requested in a follow-up study.

Recommendations

Based on the findings in this study, the following recommendations are made for consideration by the faculty in agricultural education.

1. Efforts should be made to find one or more courses in horticulture to be added to the curriculum in agricultural education.
2. Because of the indecision of such a high percentage of graduates about career choices, efforts should be increased to encourage students to take advantage of career counseling available on the campus.
3. Students who definitely do not plan to teach should be directed into courses in journalism and business management.
4. Rapport and good working relationships should be developed and maintained with the University Placement Office, especially for the benefit of those graduates who do not plan to teach.
5. Periodic follow-up studies should be conducted to maintain contact with former students and to evaluate curricular offerings by the Department.

APPENDIX

A FOLLOWUP STUDY
AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION GRADUATES
1965 to 1972
TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY

Dear Graduate:

This followup study is undertaken primarily to investigate the career patterns of TAMU Agricultural Education graduates. It is intended to provide some insight into the factors that motivate students to choose or reject the profession of teaching vocational agriculture.

In order to arrive at reasonably accurate conclusions, we must have a broad statistical sample and it is important that we get back as many questionnaires as possible. We strongly urge you to sit down and complete this instrument immediately, because each small delay makes it easier to put it off indefinitely.

You will not have to answer all the sections:

Section A should be answered by all graduates.

Section B should be answered only by all graduates who entered high school teaching.

Section C should be answered only by graduates who entered and then quit high school teaching.

Section D should be answered only by graduates who never entered high school teaching.

Please feel free to offer comments if you wish. The results of this study will be used in the never ending effort to improve the effectiveness of the Agricultural Education Department.

All of your responses will remain anonymous. Your identity is coded and the code is available only to the researcher.

Please return the completed form in the self-addressed, stamped envelope.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR HELP.

Sincerely yours,

Earl S. Webb
Professor

Thomas M. Stoner
Research Assistant

SECTION A

TO BE ANSWERED BY ALL RESPONDENTS

In the first four questions you are asked to rate the influence that the indicated persons, items or factors had upon certain decisions. Please rate as follows:

(1) No influence
(2) Little influence
(3) Some influence
(4) Strong influence
(5) Supreme influence

A1 Rate the degree of influence each of the following persons had on your decision to choose Agricultural Education as a major.

	LEVEL OF INFLUENCE				
	None	Little	Some	Strong	Supreme
	1	2	3	4	5
1. Vocational Agriculture teacher	1	2	3	4	5
2. County agent	1	2	3	4	5
3. Parents	1	2	3	4	5
4. Friends	1	2	3	4	5
5. Relatives	1	2	3	4	5
6. College faculty members	1	2	3	4	5
7. High school counselor	1	2	3	4	5
8. High school teacher (not vocational agriculture)	1	2	3	4	5
9. Other (specify) _____	1	2	3	4	5

A2 Rate the degree of influence each of the following factors had on your decision to major in Agricultural Education.

1. Desire to teach vocational agriculture	1	2	3	4	5
2. Desire to be a county agent	1	2	3	4	5
3. Secure a broad knowledge of scientific agriculture	1	2	3	4	5
4. Job security-always easy to find a teaching job	1	2	3	4	5
5. A career day presentation	1	2	3	4	5
6. Opportunity to work with youth	1	2	3	4	5
7. Opportunities in agribusiness	1	2	3	4	5
8. Involvement with FFA and/or 4-H club	1	2	3	4	5
9. Other (specify) _____	1	2	3	4	5

A6 What was the major occupation of your supporting parent (or guardian) when you entered college.

_____ 1. Full time farmer/rancher
_____ 2. Vocational agriculture teacher
_____ 3. Government agricultural worker (USDA, SCS, TAEX, etc.)
_____ 4. Agribusiness
_____ 5. Farm/ranch employee
_____ 6. Non-agricultural occupation (specify) _____

A7 From where did you enter TAMU?

_____ 1. From high school
_____ 2. From another college (including junior college)
_____ 3. From military service
_____ 4. From a full-time (non-summer) job

A8 Circle the number of undergraduate years you spent at TAMU.

1 2 3 4 5 6

A9 Post-graduate education. List all colleges, universities, etc., since receiving your bachelor's degree.

Institution	Dates	Degree	Major

A10 If it were possible for you to start college all over, would you again major in Agricultural Education?

_____ 1. Yes Comment: _____
_____ 2. No
_____ 3. Undecided

A11 Based on your experiences, would you recommend that a high school senior major in Agricultural Education?

_____ 1. Yes Comment: _____
_____ 2. No
_____ 3. Undecided

A12 While a student at Texas A&M, how did you find the faculty of the Agricultural Education Department?

_____ Very helpful Comment: _____
_____ Helpful
_____ Seldom helpful
_____ Never helpful

A3 Rate the degree of influence each of the following persons had on your decision to earn a degree from TAMU.

	LEVEL OF INFLUENCE				
	None 1	Little 2	Some 3	Strong 4	Supreme 5
1. Parents	1	2	3	4	5
2. Relatives	1	2	3	4	5
3. Friends	1	2	3	4	5
4. Vocational agriculture teacher	1	2	3	4	5
5. County agent	1	2	3	4	5
6. High school teacher (not vocational agriculture)	1	2	3	4	5
7. High school counselor	1	2	3	4	5
8. College faculty member	1	2	3	4	5
9. A former or contemporary A&M student	1	2	3	4	5

A4 Rate the degree of influence each of the following factors had on your decision to earn a degree from TAMU.

1. Nearness	1	2	3	4	5
2. Cost	1	2	3	4	5
3. Corps of Cadets	1	2	3	4	5
4. High academic standards	1	2	3	4	5
5. Good agricultural facilities	1	2	3	4	5
6. Wanted to be with friends	1	2	3	4	5
7. Desires of parents	1	2	3	4	5
8. AGGIE spirit	1	2	3	4	5
9. Other (specify) _____	1	2	3	4	5

UNLESS OTHERWISE INDICATED, CHECK ONLY ONE ANSWER TO EACH QUESTION

A5 WHEN did you first decide to major in Agricultural Education?

_____ 1. While in high school
_____ 2. Between high school and college
_____ 3. During college freshman year
_____ 4. During college sophomore year
_____ 5. During college junior year
_____ 6. Other (please specify) _____

A13 What changes, if any, do you believe should be made in the following course areas (Considering the courses that you took during college)? Circle:

(1) if you think more hours should be devoted to the course or course area, or

(2) if it should remain the same, or

(3) if hours should be decreased, or

(4) if you are undecided

COURSE OR COURSE AREA	INCREASE 1	REMAIN THE SAME 2	DECREASE 3	UNDECIDED 4
Ag Economics	1	2	3	4
Ag Education	1	2	3	4
Agronomy	1	2	3	4
Ag Engineering	1	2	3	4
Animal Science	1	2	3	4
Entomology	1	2	3	4
Horticulture	1	2	3	4
Poultry Science	1	2	3	4
Range Science	1	2	3	4
Biology	1	2	3	4
Chemistry	1	2	3	4
English	1	2	3	4
Mathematics	1	2	3	4
Educational Curriculum & Instructional	1	2	3	4
Education Psychology	1	2	3	4

A14 On the following courses or course areas which you probably did not have, circle:

(1) if you think it should be added, or

(2) if you think it should not be added, or

(3) if you are undecided

COURSE OR COURSE AREA	SHOULD BE ADDED	SHOULD NOT BE ADDED	UNDECIDED
Business Management	1	2	3
Journalism	1	2	3
Speech	1	2	3
Technical Writing	1	2	3

STOP HERE FOR INSTRUCTIONS

*If you are NOW teaching, please complete additional SECTION B ONLY.

**If you STARTED teaching and then quit, please complete additional SECTIONS B and C.

***If you NEVER taught please complete SECTION D ONLY

SECTION B

TO BE ANSWERED IF YOU ARE NOW TEACHING
OR HAVE EVER FILLED A TEACHING POSITION

B1 Rate the degree of influence each of the following factors had on your decision to enter the teaching profession

	LEVEL OF INFLUENCE				
	None	Little	Some	Strong	Supreme
	1	2	3	4	5
1. Salary level	1	2	3	4	5
2. Job security	1	2	3	4	5
3. Prestige in community	1	2	3	4	5
4. Working hours	1	2	3	4	5
5. Working with youth	1	2	3	4	5
6. Opportunity to live close to relatives	1	2	3	4	5
7. Could not find non-teaching job	1	2	3	4	5
8. Student teaching experience	1	2	3	4	5

B2 Please list all your teaching positions

School	Location	Dates	Multiple or Single Teacher Department

UNLESS OTHERWISE INDICATED, CHECK ONLY ONE ANSWER TO EACH QUESTION

B3 How did you make contact with your first employer?

_____ 1. Agricultural Education Department arranged interview

_____ 2. University Placement Office

_____ 3. Through friend

_____ 4. Other (please specify) _____

B4 What do (did) you <u>like most</u> about teaching?

_____ 1. Security

_____ 2. Working hours

_____ 3. Prestige

_____ 4. Working with youth

_____ 5. Sense of accomplishment

_____ 6. Pay

_____ 7. Being able to stay close to home

_____ 8. Lack of pressure

_____ 9. Other _____

B5 What do (did) you <u>dislike most</u> about teaching?

_____ 1. No serious dislikes

_____ 2. Salary level

_____ 3. Working hours

_____ 4. Discipline problems

_____ 5. School administration

_____ 6. Low prestige

_____ 7. Lack of advancement opportunity

_____ 8. Community pressure

_____ 9. Pressure of meeting classes every day

_____ 10. Other (specify) _____

_____

_____

SECTION C

TO BE ANSWERED IF YOU HAVE LEFT HIGH SCHOOL TEACHING

C1 Rate the degree of influence each of the following factors had on your decision to leave teaching.

	LEVEL OF INFLUENCE				
	None 1	Little 2	Some 3	Strong 4	Supreme 5
1. Salary level	1	2	3	4	5
2. Disillusioned with teaching	1	2	3	4	5
3. Discipline problems in school	1	2	3	4	5
4. Problems with school administrators	1	2	3	4	5
5. Wanted to move closer to home (or wife's home)	1	2	3	4	5
6. Enter a more interesting profession	1	2	3	4	5
7. Long working hours	1	2	3	4	5
8. Poor teaching facilities	1	2	3	4	5
9. Other (specify) _____	1	2	3	4	5

C2 What was your first job after leaving teaching?

Job Title _____ Employer _____

Length of Employment _____years _____months

C3 What is your present job? (Write same if no change)

Job Title _____ Employer _____

Length of Employment _____years _____months

C4 Annual gross salary earned in full-time employment on your FIRST non-teaching job and on your PRESENT job. If you are self-employed, show income before taxes. Place an "X" in the appropriate blocks; this information will be handled confidentially.

	BELOW 6,000	6,000 - 6,999	7,000 - 7,999	8,000 - 8,999	9,000 - 9,999	10,000 - 12,499	12,500 - 14,999	15,000 - 19,999	20,000 - 24,999	25,000 AND OVER
FIRST job, beginning salary										
PRESENT job, present salary										

C5 To what extent has your teaching experience been of help to you in your present employment?

____ 1. Tremendous help

____ 2. Much help

____ 3. Some help

____ 4. No help

SECTION D

TO BE ANSWERED IF YOU HAVE NEVER TAUGHT
(DISREGARD STUDENT TEACHING)

	LEVEL OF INFLUENCE				
	None	Little	Some	Strong	Supreme
	1	2	3	4	5

D1 Rate the degree of influence each of the following factors had on your decision not to enter the teaching profession.

1.	Salary level too low	1	2	3	4	5
2.	Prestige too low	1	2	3	4	5
3.	Could not find suitable teaching job	1	2	3	4	5
4.	Wanted to enter full-time farming	1	2	3	4	5
5.	Military obligations	1	2	3	4	5
6.	Found a more interesting position	1	2	3	4	5
7.	Wife (or husband) was against it	1	2	3	4	5

D2 When did you decide not to teach?

_____ 1. Never intended to teach
_____ 2. Before student teaching
_____ 3. During student teaching
_____ 4. After starting job hunting
_____ 5. While in military

D3 How did you make contact with your first employer?

_____ 1. Agricultural Education Department arranged interview
_____ 2. University Placement Office
_____ 3. Through friend
_____ 4. Other (please specify) _____

D4 What was your first job after leaving TAMU?

Job Title _____ Employer _____

Length of Job _____ years _____ months

D5 What is your present job? (Write same if no change)

Job Title _____ Employer _____

Length of Job _____ years _____ months

D6 Annual gross salary earned in full-time employment on your FIRST non-teaching job and on your PRESENT job. If you are self-employed, show income before taxes. Place an "X" in the appropriate blocks; this information will be handled confidentially.

	BELOW 6,000	6,000 - 6,999	7,000 - 7,999	8,000 - 8,999	9,000 - 9,999	10,000 - 12,499	12,500 - 14,999	15,000 - 19,999	20,000 - 24,999	25,000 AND OVER
FIRST job, beginning salary										
PRESENT job, Present salary										

D7 To what extent has student teaching helped you in your non-teaching jobs?

_____ 1. Immense help
_____ 2. Much help
_____ 3. Some help
_____ 4. No help
_____ 5. Did not do student teaching

PLEASE RETURN THIS QUESTIONNAIRE TO:

Dr. Earl S. Webb
Agricultural Education Department
Texas A&M University
College Station, Texas 77843

IDENTIFICATION CODE: _____